APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,580	07/12/2001	Shell Sterling Simpson	10007646-1	4266

7590	11/14/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
LESNIEWSKI, VICTOR D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 August 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-17,19-30 and 33-38* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-17,19-30 and 33-38* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *34-36* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed 7/19/2005 has been placed of record in the file.

2. Claims 1, 5, 6, 15, 19, 20, 29, and 33 have been amended.

3. Claims 4, 18, 31, and 32 have been canceled.

4. Claims 1-3, 5-17, 19-30, and 33-38 are now pending.

5. The applicant's arguments with respect to the amended claims have been considered but are moot in view of the following new grounds of rejection.

6. The applicant's arguments with respect to non-amended claims 13, 14, 27, 28, 37, and 38 were addressed in the advisory action dated 7/29/2005. No new arguments concerning these claims have been set forth.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

7. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. The applicant's submission filed 8/25/2005 has been entered.

Claim Objections

8. Claims 34-36 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- Claim 34 makes claim to "The system of Claim 31," however, with the amendment, claim 31 has been canceled and therefore claim 34 cannot be dependent on it. For the

purpose of applying prior art it will be assumed that claim 34 makes claim to "The

system of Claim 33."

- Claims 35 and 36 are objected to due to their dependence on claim 34.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

10.   Claims 13, 14, 27, 28, and 33-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Adolfsson (U.S. Patent Number 6,092,078) in view of Zothner (U.S. Patent

Number 6,751,657).

11.   Claims 13, 14, 27, 28, 37, and 38 have not been amended and remain rejected as

previously presented. The detail of the rejection is presented again below.

12.   Despite the amendment to claim 33, claims 33-36 recite limitations similar to those

previously presented and thus do not overcome the prior art as discussed in detail below.

13.   Adolfsson disclosed a method and apparatus for interfacing network peripheral devices

with a web browser where the web browser provides the user with a graphical user interface that

allows the user to control different options of the peripherals. In an analogous art, Zothner

disclosed a business rules manager module that associates business rules with actions in terms of

the role of a user in the system. Zothner's system is designed for an object-oriented client-server environment and Adolfsson's system is exemplary of this type of network.

14.   Concerning claims 13, 14, 27, 28, 33, 37, and 38, Adolfsson did not explicitly state that his system could differentiate between interface accessible controls that the user has permission to access and those that he does not. He also did not explicitly state accessing a user record. However, Zothner's system describes a set of user profiles that help define the role of each user and contain security and permission information for each user. Since the inventions encompass the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of Adolfsson by adding the ability to check for user permissions and access a user record as provided by Zothner. This would make sense because it would allow a higher degree of management and security features in Adolfsson's system. Zothner cites the need for this expanded capability in management as being important to the availability and reliability of network systems (see column 4, line 62 through column 5, line 12), two features that are very important to Adolfsson's system for continuously monitoring information. This motivation also applies to those dependent claims utilizing the same combination.

15.   Some claims will be discussed together. Those claims which are essentially the same except that they set forth the claimed invention as a computer program product are rejected under the same rationale applied to the described claim.

16.   Thereby, the combination of Adolfsson and Zothner discloses:

- o <Claims 13 and 27>

  A method for mediating access to production options, comprising: acquiring a user's access request for a production device (Adolfsson, column 5, lines 21-24); accessing a record established for the user, the record containing data representing the production options for the production device to which the user does and/or does not have permission to access (Zothner, column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 8); generating a web page for the production device according to the user's record; and presenting the user with the generated interface (Adolfsson, column 3, lines 25-32).

- o <Claims 14 and 28>

  A method for mediating access to production options, comprising: acquiring a user's access request for a production device (Adolfsson, column 5, lines 21-24); retrieving a web page for the production device, the web page having user accessible controls for selecting production options (Adolfsson, column 3, lines 25-32); accessing a record established for the user, the record containing data representing the production options for the production device to which the user does and/or does not have permission to access (Zothner, column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 8); and altering the web page according to the user's record; and presenting the user with the modified web page (Adolfsson, column 5, lines 35-60).

- o <Claim 33>

  In a computer network, a system for managing electronic document production, the system comprising: a production device (Adolfsson, column 2, lines 64-67); a client operable to identify a target document, issue a user's access request for a selected

production device, and select production options (Adolfsson, column 4, lines 21-23 and

column 5, lines 21-49); a production server operable to serve an interface having user

accessible controls for selecting production options for the target document (Adolfsson,

column 5, lines 35-60); a permission service operable to retrieve the interface from the

production server for the selected production device, access a user's record containing

data representing production options to which the user does and/or does not have

permission to access, modify the interface according to the user's record, and direct to the

client the modified interface (Adolfsson, column 5, lines 35-60 and Zothner, column 9,

line 64 through column 10, line 8 and column 19, lines 15-31).

o <Claim 34>

The system of Claim 31, further comprising a permission engine operable to generate an

interface having user accessible controls for managing user records (Zothner, column 9,

line 64 through column 10, line 8).

o <Claim 35>

The system of Claim 34, further comprising one or more device records, each device

record containing data representing the production options offered by the particular

production device, and wherein the permission engine is operable to parse the device

records to generate the interface for managing the user records (Adolfsson, column 9, line

66 through column 10, line 10 and column 16, lines 44-50).

o <Claim 36>

The system of Claim 35, further comprising: a device locator operable to detect new

production devices; and an update service operable to create a device record for each

newly detected production device (Adolfsson, column 16, line 51 through column 17,

line 5).

o <Claim 37>

In a computer network, a system for managing electronic document production, the

system comprising: a production device (Adolfsson, column 2, lines 64-67); one or more

user records, each user record containing data representing the production options to

which the particular user does and/or does not have permission to access (Zothner,

column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 8); a production server in communication with

the production device and operable to generate an interface for that production device

according to a user record (Adolfsson, column 3, lines 25-32); a client operable to

identify a target document, issue a user's access request for the production device, and

select production options (Adolfsson, column 4, lines 21-23 and column 5, lines 21-49); a

permission service operable to access the user's record, direct the production server to

generate an interface for the production device according to the user's record, and to

direct to the client the generated interface (Adolfsson, column 3, lines 25-32 and Zothner,

column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 8 and column 19, lines 15-31); one or more

device records, each device record containing data representing the production options

offered by the particular production device (Adolfsson, column 9, line 66 through column

10, line 10); a permission engine operable to parse the device records and generate an

web page for managing user records (Adolfsson, column 16, lines 44-50 and column 4,

lines 21-23 and Zothner, column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 8); a device locator

operable to detect new production devices; and an update service operable to create a

device record for each newly detected production device (Adolfsson, column 16, line 51

through column 17, line 5).

o <Claim 38>

In a computer network, a system for managing electronic document production, the

system comprising: a production device (Adolfsson, column 2, lines 64-67); one or more

user records, each user record containing, for each production device, data representing

the production options to which the particular user does and/or does not have permission

to access (Zothner, column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 8); a production server in

communication with the production device and operable to serve an interface for that

production device, the interface having user accessible controls for selecting production

options for the production device (Adolfsson, column 3, lines 25-32); a client operable to

identify a target document, issue a user's access request for the production device, and

select production options (Adolfsson, column 4, lines 21-23 and column 5, lines 21-49); a

permission service operable to access the user's record, retrieve the interface from the

production server, modify the interface according to the user's record, and to direct to the

client the modified interface (Adolfsson, column 5, lines 21-60 and Zothner, column 9,

line 64 through column 10, line 8 and column 19, lines 15-31); one or more device

records, each device record containing data representing the production options offered

by the particular production device (Adolfsson, column 9, line 66 through column 10,

line 10); a permission engine operable to parse the device records and generate an web

page for managing user records (Adolfsson, column 16, lines 44-50 and column 4, lines

21-23 and Zothner, column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 8); a device locator

operable to detect new production devices; and an update service operable to create a

device record for each newly detected production device (Adolfsson, column 16, line 51

through column 17, line 5).

Since the combination of Adolfsson and Zothner discloses all of the above limitations, claims 13,

14, 27, 28, and 33-38 are rejected.

17.   Claims 1-3, 6-8, 11, 12, 15-17, 20-22, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Adolfsson in view of Hart, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,154,843),

hereinafter referred to as Hart.

18.   Adolfsson disclosed a method and apparatus for interfacing network peripheral devices

with a web browser where the web browser provides the user with a graphical user interface that

allows the user to control different options of the peripherals. In an analogous art, Hart disclosed

a secure remote access computing system that utilizes a custom user interface to allow a user to

execute tasks on a secure private network from an unsecured remote computer.

19.   Concerning claims 1 and 15, Adolfsson did not explicitly state that his system could

differentiate between interface accessible controls that the user has permission to access and

those that he does not. Although his system generates a user interface for the user, he is also not

explicit about dynamically generating the interface. However, Hart's system dynamically

generates a custom program for the user based on a verification of the user's security privileges.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention to modify the system of Adolfsson by adding the ability to check for user permissions

and generate the interface dynamically as provided by Hart. This would make sense because it

would allow a higher degree of management and security features in Adolfsson's system. Hart

cites the need for more secure remote access of a device which requires only a minimum number

of features and sets out to solve the problem with a customized real-time program with which to

access the device (see column 2, lines 16-27 and 47-59). This motivation also applies to those

dependent claims utilizing the same combination.

20.   Thereby, the combination of Adolfsson and Hart discloses:

o   <Claims 1 and 15>

   A method for mediating access to production options, comprising: acquiring a user's

   access request for a production device (Adolfsson, column 5, lines 21-24); accessing data

   representing production options to which the user does and/or does not have permission

   to access (Adolfsson, column 3, lines 25-28 and Hart, column 5, line 59 through column

   6, line 11); in response to the user's access request, dynamically generating an interface

   according to the accessed data so that the user interface provides user accessible controls

   for only those options for which the user has permission to access (Hart, column 3, lines

   3-12 and column 6, lines 12-34); and presenting the user with the generated interface

   (Adolfsson, column 3, lines 25-32).

o   <Claims 2 and 16>

   The method of Claim 1, wherein the act of acquiring comprises intercepting an access

   request directed to the production device (Adolfsson, column 3, lines 6-9).

o   <Claims 3 and 17>

   The method of Claim 1, wherein the act of acquiring comprises redirecting the access

   request (Adolfsson, column 2, lines 61-63).

o   \<Claims 6 and 20\>

The method of Claim 1, wherein the act of generating comprises generating the interface

in the form of a web page and the act of presenting comprises presenting the generated

web page to a web browser (Adolfsson, column 4, lines 21-23).

o   \<Claims 7 and 21\>

The method of Claim 1, wherein the act of providing comprises: retrieving an interface

for the production device, the interface having user accessible controls for selecting

production options for the production device (Adolfsson, column 5, lines 35-49);

modifying the interface to allow the user access to the controls for only the production

options for which the user has permission to access (Hart, column 6, lines 12-34); and

presenting the user with the modified interface (Adolfsson, column 5, lines 50-60).

o   \<Claims 8 and 22\>

The method of Claim 7, wherein the act of modifying comprises: accessing data

representing production options to which the user does and/or does not have permission

to access (Hart, column 5, line 59 through column 6, line 11); and modifying the interface

according to the accessed data providing user accessible controls for only those options

for which the user has permission to access (Adolfsson, column 5, lines 35-49).

o   \<Claims 11 and 25\>

The method of Claim 7, wherein the acts of retrieving and modifying are performed on a

network device other than the production device (Adolfsson, column 3, lines 4-16).

o   <Claims 12 and 26>

The method of Claim 7 wherein the act of retrieving comprises retrieving the interface in

the form of a web page, and the act of presenting comprises presenting the modified web

page to a web browser (Adolfsson, column 4, lines 21-23).

Since the combination of Adolfsson and Hart discloses all of the above limitations, claims 1-3, 6-

8, 11, 12, 15-17, 20-22, 25, and 26 are rejected.

21.   Claims 5, 9, 10, 19, 23, 24, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Adolfsson in view of Hart, as applied above, further in view of Zothner.

22.   The combination of Adolfsson and Hart disclosed a method and apparatus for interfacing

network peripheral devices with a web browser where the web browser provides the user with a

dynamically generated graphical user interface that allows the user to control the different

options of the devices for which he has permission. In an analogous art, Zothner disclosed a

business rules manager module that associates business rules with actions in terms of the role of

a user in the system.

23.   Concerning independent claim 29 and like dependent claims, the combination of

Adolfsson and Hart did not explicitly state accessing a user record in order to generate the

interface. Although the combination of Adolfsson and Hart does check permissions for a

specific user, it is not specific about using user records. However, Zothner's system describes a

set of user profiles that help define the role of each user and contain security and permission

information for each user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the applicant's invention to modify the combination of Adolfsson and Hart by adding the

ability to access a user record as provided by Zothner. This would make sense because it would

allow a higher degree of management and security features in the combination of Adolfsson and

Hart. Zothner cites the need for this expanded capability in management as being important to

the availability and reliability of network systems (see column 4, line 62 through column 5, line

12), two features that are very important to the combination of Adolfsson and Hart for

information access and monitoring. This motivation also applies to those dependent claims

utilizing the same combination.

24.   Thereby, the combination of Adolfsson, Hart, and Zothner discloses:

   o   <Claims 5 and 19>

       The method of Claim 1, wherein the act of accessing comprises obtaining credentials for

       the user and locating a user record using the credentials, the user record containing the

       data representing production options to which the user does and/or does not have

       permission to access (Zothner, column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 8).

   o   <Claims 9 and 23>

       The method of Claim 8, wherein the interface is a web page containing instructions for

       displaying controls for selecting production options and wherein the instructions are

       associated with one or more tags each tag identifying a particular production option,

       wherein the act of altering comprises identifying the tags for production options to which

       the user does not have access and altering the instructions associated with those tags

       (Zothner, column 19, line 58 through column 20, line 4).

o   <Claims 10 and 24>

The method of Claim 8, wherein the act of accessing comprises obtaining credentials for

the user and locating a record for the user using the credentials, the record containing the

data representing production options to which the user does and/or does not have

permission to access (Hart, column 6, lines 8-11 and Zothner, column 9, line 64 through

column 10, line 8).

o   <Claim 29>

In a computer network, a system for managing electronic document production, the

system comprising: a production device (Adolfsson, column 2, lines 64-67); a client

operable to identify a target document, issue a user's access request for a selected

production device, and select production options (Adolfsson, column 4, lines 21-23 and

column 5, lines 21-49); a production server operable to dynamically generate an interface

according to a user's record containing data representing production options to which the

user does and/or does not have permission to access (Hart, column 3, lines 3-12 and

column 6, lines 12-34 and Zothner, column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 8); a

permission service in electronic communication with the client and the production device,

the permission service operable to acquire the access request for the production device

(Adolfsson, column 3, lines 25-32) and in response to direct the production server to

generate an interface according to the user's record (Zothner, column 9, line 64 through

column 10, line 8) so that the user interface provides user accessible controls for only

those options for which the user has permission to access (Hart, column 5, line 59

through column 6, line 34), and to direct to the client the generated interface (Adolfsson, column 3, lines 25-32).

o <Claim 30>

The system of Claim 29, wherein an interface is a web page and the client is a web browser (Adolfsson, column 4, lines 21-23).

Since the combination of Adolfsson, Hart, and Zothner discloses all of the above limitations, claims 5, 9, 10, 19, 23, 24, 29, and 30 are rejected.

Conclusion

25.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

o Cason et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,035,300) disclosed a method for generating a user interface from the entities, attributes, and relationships of a data model.

o Travostino et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,564,325) disclosed a method for providing multi-level security access to a system that generates an interface that permits software code to successfully call only allowed operations.

o Jenkins et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,678,682) disclosed an automated enterprise access management control system that utilizes access management control schema.

26.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor Lesniewski whose telephone number is 571-272-3987. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Victor Lesniewski
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2152

BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
PRIMARY EXAMINER